



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## V.—THE STRUCTURE OF DIONYSII HALICARNASSENSIS EPISTULA II AD AMMAEUM.

With the plan and the specifications before one, it ought not to be hard to discern how far the completed work fulfils the contract. Dionysius, in the opening of his second letter to Ammaeus, sets forth so clearly the outline of his work and his method of procedure that discrepancies and omissions in the treatise as preserved to us may be easily detected.

In response to a request of Ammaeus, Dionysius proposes first to repeat what he has previously said about Thucydides, and then to take up each point and adduce in proof examples from the historian. Accordingly, he begins with a passage from the *De Thucydide Iudicium*, quoted almost without change. He then proceeds to a detailed and systematic exposition of the statements made, and thereafter immediately brings the letter to a close. A careful comparison, therefore, of chapters III–XVII with the preliminary outline in chapter II (a passage fortunately supported by double tradition) should show us whether the treatise has suffered loss or disarrangement.

The theses of chapter II may be disposed as follows :

- (a) ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς ἐκλογῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων τὴν τροπικὴν καὶ γλωττηματικὴν καὶ ἀπηρχαιωμένην καὶ ξένην λέξιν παραλαμβάνων πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῆς κοινῆς καὶ συνήθους τοῖς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀνθρώποις,
- (b) ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν σχηματισμῶν . . . τοτὲ μὲν λόγον ἐξ ὀνόματος ποιῶν,
- (c) τοτὲ δὲ εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον\*
- (d) καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικῶς ἐκφέρων,
- (e) αὖθις δὲ τοῦτομα ῥῆμα ποιῶν\*
- (f) καὶ αὐτῶν γε τούτων ἀναστρέφων τὰς χρήσεις, ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν <προσηγορικὸν γένηται,
- (g) τὸ δὲ προσηγορικὸν ὀνοματικῶς><sup>1</sup> λέγεται,
- (h) καὶ τὰ μὲν παθητικὰ ῥήματα δραστήρια,

<sup>1</sup> ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν λέγεται PG; ἵνα τὸ μὲν ὀνοματικὸν ῥηματικὸν, τὸ δὲ ῥηματικὸν ὀνοματικὸν λέγεται inpudenti interpolatione CD: orationem mancā ex Θ [De Thuc. Iud., c. 24, p. 867 Reisk.] supplendam esse vidit Reiskius.—Usener.

- (i) τὰ δὲ δραστήρια παθητικά·  
 (j) πληθυντικῶν δὲ καὶ ἐνικῶν ἀλλάττων τὰς φύσεις καὶ ἀντικατηγορῶν ταῦτα ἀλλήλων,  
 (k) θηλυκά τ' ἀρρενικοῖς καὶ ἀρρενικά θηλυκοῖς καὶ οὐδέτερα τοιτοισὶ συνάπτων, ἐξ ὧν ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἀκολουθία πλανᾶται·  
 (l) τὰς δὲ <τῶν> ὀνοματικῶν ἢ μετοχικῶν πτώσεις τοτὲ μὲν πρὸς τὸ σημαίνοντον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος ἀποστρέφων,  
 (m) τοτὲ δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαιομένου·  
 (n) ἐν δὲ τοῖς συνδετικοῖς καὶ τοῖς προθετικοῖς μορίοις καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς διαρθροῦσι τὰς τῶν ὀνομάτων δυνάμεις ποιητοῦ τρόπον ἐνεξουσιάζων.  
 (o) πλείστα δ' ἂν τις εὖροι παρ' αὐτῷ τῶν σχημάτων, προσώπων τε ἀποστροφαῖς  
 (p) καὶ χρόνων ἐναλλαγαῖς  
 (q) καὶ τοπικῶν<sup>1</sup> σημειώσεων μεταφοραῖς ἐξηλλαγμένα καὶ σολοικισμῶν λαμβάνοντα φαντασίας·  
 (r) ὅποσα τε γίνεται πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων  
 (s) ἢ σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων,  
 (t) καὶ ἐφ' ὧν ἐνθυμημάτων τε καὶ νοημάτων αἱ μεταξὺ παρεμπτώσεις πολλὰι γινόμεναι διὰ μακροῦ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν κομίζονται,  
 (u) τὰ τε σκολιὰ καὶ πολὺπλοκα καὶ δυσεξέλικτα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ συγγενῇ τούτοις.  
 (v) εὖροι δ' ἂν τις οὐκ ὀλίγα καὶ τῶν θεατρικῶν σχημάτων κείμενα παρ' αὐτῷ, τὰς παρισώσεις λέγω καὶ παρομοιώσεις καὶ παρονομασίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις, ἐν αἷς ἐπλεόνασε Γοργίας ὁ Δεοντίνος καὶ οἱ περὶ Πῶλον καὶ Δικύμιον καὶ πολλοὶ ἄλλοι τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν ἀκμασάντων.

Now, how closely do the expository chapters conform to this outline?

Chapter III deals with the first topic (a). Instead of the terms *τροπικός*, *γλωττηματικός*, *ἀπηρχαιωμένος*, *ξένος*, are found *γλωσσηματικός*, *ἀπηρχαιωμένος*, *δυσείκαστος*, and *ποιητικός*; but these variations are unimportant.

The following chapter presents a difficulty. It begins, it is true, with the subject of periphrasis (b), and ends with that of brachylogy (c); but as the text stands, the transition is not clear. The chapter reads: *ὅταν μὲν οὖν μίαν λέξιν εἴτε ὀνοματικὴν εἴτε ῥηματικὴν*

<sup>1</sup> This is the reading of the manuscripts here and in the De Thuc. Iudicium. Krüger wrote *τροπικῶν*, and has been followed by van Herwerden and Usener. It seems possible, however, to keep the manuscript reading and understand a reference to Thucydides' proleptic use of prepositions and adverbs of place, e. g. II 5, 29; V 52, 11. This is favored by the coupling with *χρόνων*.

ἐν πλείοσιν ὀνόμασιν ἢ ῥήμασιν ἐκφέρῃ περιφράζων τὴν αὐτὴν νόησιν, τοιαύτην ποιεῖ τὴν λέξιν· “ἦν γὰρ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς βεβαίωτατα δὴ φύσεως ἰσχὺν δηλώσας καὶ διαφερόντως τι ἐς αὐτὸ μᾶλλον ἐτέρου ἄξιος θαυμάσαι.” καὶ μὴν ἐν τῷ ἐπιταφίῳ γέγραπεν· “οὐδ’ αὖ κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν, ἀξιώματος ἀφανεία κεκώλυται.” καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὸ σημαίνοντον ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον τοιοῦτον, ὡς ἐπὶ τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου Βρασίδα τέθηκεν, ὅτε μαχόμενος περὶ Πύλον ἀπὸ τῆς νεῶς τραυματίας γενόμενος ἐξέπεσεν· “πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ” φησὶν “εἰς τὴν παρεξαιρεσίαν ἢ ἀσπίς περιερρῆ”· βούλεται γὰρ δηλοῦν· “πεσόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔξω τῆς νεῶς ἐπὶ τὰ προέχοντα μέρη τῆς εἰρεσίας.” Krüger’s proposition to read for τὸ σημαίνοντον, σχηματίζων ὄνομα and regard κατὰ πενίαν as a substitute for πένης μὲν ὦν, according to Dionysius’ criticism, τοτὲ δὲ εἰς ὄνομα συνάγων τὸν λόγον, is taken up by Usener, who, passing over van Herwerden’s suggestion of a lacuna,<sup>1</sup> emends τὸ σημαίνοντον to τὸ σύντομον and accepts the interpretation given by Krüger to the passage. To this interpretation there are several objections. Apart from the fact that κατὰ πενίαν is scarcely more concise than πένης μὲν ὦν, the transition from periphrasis to brachylogy is made through καὶ μὴν alone; an example is introduced before the statement of that which it illustrates; and the passage violates the usage of the writer, since ποιεῖ τὸν λόγον and similar expressions are throughout the epistle used with a personal subject. There seems to be no doubt that there is a lacuna after τὸ σημαίνοντον; for (save here) up to the long citations in chapters XV and XVI, Dionysius uniformly points out the particulars in which he criticizes the passages quoted, and gives what is in his view a more natural rendering. In the present sentence, καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις τὸ σημαίνοντον is the introduction to this explanation. Compare chapter VII (p. 797, 8), καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις; chapter X (799, 13), καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα; chapter VII (797, 4) and chapter X (799, 14), ἦν δὲ τὸ σημαίνοντον.

In chapters V and VI the use of nouns for verbs (*d*) and the use of verbs for nouns (*e*) are considered in due order.

The next topic in the outline (according to the emendation demanded by the text of the *De Thucydide Iudicium*) is the substitution of τὸ προσηγορικόν for τὸ ὀνομαστικόν and *vice versa* (*f*), (*g*). But since chapter VII opens with a question of voice (*h*), it is evident that a lacuna should be noted between chapters VI and VII.

Chapters VII, VIII and IX handle, respectively, the use of the

<sup>1</sup>“Intactum reliqui locum corruptissimum . . . neque ipse reperi quod satisfaceret. Vereor autem, ne quid exciderit post σημαίνοντον.”

active for the passive (*h*), the use of the passive for the active (*i*), and interchange of number (*j*).

In the succeeding chapters there is not a little confusion. The tenth has to do with gender, yet not as regards agreement (*k*), but as regards word-forms involving an unusual gender, e. g. *ὁ δῆλος* for *ἡ δῆλησις*, *τὸ βουλόμενον* for *ἡ βούλησις*. The eleventh begins with the subject of declensional forms: *ἐν οἷς δὲ τὰς πτώσεις τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ τῶν προσηγοριῶν καὶ τῶν μετοχῶν καὶ <τῶν> συναπτομένων τοῦτοις ἄρθρων ἐξαλλάττει τοῦ συνήθους, οὕτως σχηματίζει τὴν φράσιν*· but nothing is said here of the *πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος* of (*l*). The illustrative passage cited from Thucydides contains, however, an example of construction *κατὰ σύνεσιν*, as well as examples of case-usage at variance with the customary idiom. The twelfth chapter treats of tenses; and at the close there is a slight digression caused by the fact that a citation from Thucydides contains a solecism in point of agreement in case. The thirteenth chapter takes up the subject of grammatical *versus* logical agreement, a matter already touched upon in chapter XI; but whereas gender was there concerned, the present section deals with variation in number. The statement of the subject of the paragraph, however,—*ὅταν δὲ πρὸς τὸ σημαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαινομένου πράγματος τὴν ἀποστροφὴν ποιῆται ἢ πρὸς τὸ σημαίνόμενον ἀπὸ τοῦ σημαίνοντος, οὕτως σχηματίζει τὸν λόγον*—supplements the statement in chapter XI in such a way that the two combined repeat the phraseology of (*l*) and (*m*), but with different division. Since the fourteenth chapter considers the question of *πράγματα ἀντὶ σωμάτων* and *σώματα ἀντὶ πραγμάτων*, (*r*) and (*s*)—though in reverse order—it is obvious that much has fallen out between chapters XIII and XIV; and following the lead of Krüger, later editors have marked a lacuna in the text. Transposition, moreover, is necessary in order to bring chapter XII into its proper place; for, as has been said, this treats of tenses (*p*), and is clearly a rescued fragment of the section lost.<sup>1</sup> The other irregularities seem the result of hastiness or carelessness on the part of the author.

The remaining chapters—XV, XVI, XVII—explain in proper course the topics given in (*t*), (*u*), (*v*); and, save the omission of *παρονομασία* in the enumeration in chapter XVII, there is no discrepancy in the restatement of the points of criticism.

WINIFRED WARREN.

<sup>1</sup> A hint as to the exposition of (*o*) may be found in De Thuc. Ind., p. 935, 15 sqq.